

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Decision on Appeal mailed on August 22, 2008. Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-25 have been previously rejected by the Examiner and subsequently reviewed on appeal. The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reversed the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicants elect to reopen prosecution. Applicants submit herein appropriate amendments to the claims, which Applicants respectfully submit overcome the new rejections. These amendments are described in more detail below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Decision on Appeal stated that in claims 1, 10, 15, and 17, the portion of clause (c) directed to “accessing the package data” is not supported in the specification. In response, claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 have been amended such that the phrase “accessing the package data correlated to the selected unresolved package” is replaced with the phrase “matching a selected catalog entry identifier with a package identifier.” Support for this amendment can be found on page 10, line 12, to page 11, line 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, 15, and 17, as amended, now comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Decision on Appeal stated that claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 are directed to non-statutory subject matter, which does not require the use of a machine or otherwise recite a

machine or computer implemented method. In response, claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 have been amended as follows.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “computer system” instead of an “e-commerce system.” Claim 10 has been amended to recite a “computer-implemented method” instead of an “e-commerce method.” Claim 15 has been amended to recite that the program product is stored on a computer readable “storage medium.” Claim 17 has been amended to recite a computer-readable “storage medium” instead of a computer-readable “signal-baring medium.”

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, 15, and 17, as amended, now comply with 35 U.S.C. §101.

CONCLUSION

Applicants’ attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants’ attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

November 4, 2008

/ Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728
(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549